



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,190	05/11/2001	Tomoo Fujioka	Y-183	7211

802 7590 08/12/2002

DELLETT AND WALTERS
310 S.W. FOURTH AVENUE
SUITE 1101
PORTLAND, OR 97204

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TUAN M

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2828

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Applicant No.	Applicant(s)
	09/854,190	FUJIOKA ET AL.
	Examiner Tuan M Nguyen	Art Unit 2828

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.



PAUL J.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Drawings***

1. The drawing (figs 1a-7b) is objected for minor informaty. The boxes show in figures 1a-7b are not labeled as required by 37 CFR 1.83(a). Applicant is required to submit a drawing correction for approval as require by rule 37 CFR 1.123

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, recites a w-axicon mirror disposed at the other end of the straight slab and the relationship between the center offset Xm and the center position of the trick mirror is set to Xm less than or equal 1.1 X0 without the recitation of any structure or definition for the w-axicon mirror, which render the claim confusing, vague and indefinite. Claim 1 recites of “in such a manner” fails to clearly define the invention, which render the claim vague and indefinite. Claim 1 further recites “a pair of cylindrical electrodes of different diameter disposed concentrically” which is inconsistent with the specification, page 3 which render the claim confusing, vague and indefinite.

Regarding claim 2 recite the output laser beam from the output mirror has “substantially Gaussian distribution” when it is focused by the lens. The claim fails to clearly define the “substantially Gaussian distribution” which render the claims confusing, vague, and indefinite.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-2 provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1, 3 and 5 of copending Application No. 09/854,421. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: Claims 1, 3 and 5 of copending application number 09/854,421 recite a cylindrical straight slab type gas laser comprising every elements as recited in claims 1, and 2 of this application. Although, the claim language is not identical, the claims are not patentable

Art Unit: 2828

distinct from each other. Claim 1 of copending application number 09/854,421 recites "vertically and concentrically" which is less boarder limitation than "concentrically" as recited in claim 1 of this application. Furthermore, claim 1 of this application recites additionally limitation of the relationship between the offset Xm and the center position of the trick mirror. Other than these limitations, the claims are considered as identical which complies with the rule 37 CFR § 1.75 for double patenting.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sukhman et al (US patent 5,661,746) in view of Holmes et al (US patent 4,514,850).

With respect to claim 1, Sukhman et al disclose free-space gas slab laser comprising a gas slab laser (10), a pair of cylindrical electrodes (11, 12), the spacer (99), the gap (40), an output mirror (15) is output coupler only partially reflective emitting laser light beam (16), the Gaussian beam (17), the reflective mirror (14), the diameters (D1 and D2), note cols. 6-13, see figs 1-12. However, Sukhman fails to discuss about w-axicon mirror disposed at the other end of the straight slab and the center position . Whereas Holmes et al disclose the w-axicon mirror disposed at the other end of the straight slab and the center position, note cols. 1-5, see figs. 1-6. For the benefit of the w-axicon mirror disposed at the other end of the straight slab and center position, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Sukhman with the w-axicon mirror disposed at the other end of the straight slab and the center position as taught or suggested by Holmes.




FIG 1




FIG 2

34

50

51

D2

D1

R

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

With respect to claim 2, Sukhman et al discussed about the partial relationship between the diameter of the Gaussian beam of the fundamental mode and the electrodes inside of the free space slab laser, note cols. 5-6, see fig 1.

Citation Of The Pertinent References

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon us considered pertinent to applicant's disclose.

The patent to Chenausky (US patent 5,748,663) discloses rectangular discharge gas laser.

The patent to Freiberg (US patent 4,744,090) discloses high extraction efficiency annular resonator.

The patent to George (US patent 4,087,763) disclose method and apparatus for secondary laser pumping by electron beam excitation.

The patent to Tulip (US patent 4,719,639) discloses carbon dioxide slab laser.

The patent to Logan et al (US patent 4,991,182) discloses optical relay imaging in the common pass annular laser amplifier.

The patent to Holmes (US patent 4,516,244) discloses common-pass decentered annular ring resonator with improved polarization control.

The patent to Macken et al(US patent 5,528,613) discloses laser apparatus utilizing a magnetically enhanced electrical discharge with transverse ac stabilization.


The patent to Macken (US patent 5,128,953) discloses transmissive optics for high power lasers.

Communication Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan M Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-0247. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Ip can be reached on (703) 308-3098. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 306-5511 for regular communications and (703) 306-5511 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-3329.


Paul Ip
SPE
Art unit 2828

TMN
August 7, 2002